3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

another 200,000 who held property jointly and were not included in his computations.

On the assumption that a holding of less than 3 hectares was totally inadequate, at the Rumanian level of production, to provide a family with even the bare means of subsistence, Creangă concluded that over 60 per cent of the peasant cultivators (landless peasants plus those with less than 3 hectares), "for the most part heads of families, find themselves in unconditional dependence upon landowners and tenants." [11] If peasants owning between 3 and 5 hectares —holdings certainly on the margin of subsistence—are included, it appears that nearly 85 per cent of the peasants were unable to earn a secure living from the produce of their soil and had to seek additional income elsewhere.

The concentration of land in great estates does not, of course, necessarily imply an agrarian crisis; English and Prussian agriculture developed successfully on large properties. Nor does the peasant's need to go beyond his own holding to earn a living necessarily spell misery for him. The reason the large estate appeared at this time to be the central feature of the Rumanian agrarian problem lies in the particular development of rural property and labor relations in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Unfortunately, the background of Rumanian agrarian history is still extremely obscure. The original social function and source of privilege of the landowning nobles, the boyars, have been the subject of several notable but inconclusive controversies among Rumanian scholars. It is not certain when and to what degree the mass of Rumanian cultivators were reduced to a servile status. Evidence provided by villages of *răzeşi* and *moşneni*—free peasant communities with a form of common landholding, which have survived as relics in the hilly districts—suggests that they at one time were a prevalent form of rural organization, but scientific investigation of these villages has been undertaken only in recent years.[12] There is no question, however, that by the eighteenth century the boyars—and the monasteries—had come to control a great deal of the land, to which

11. Creangă, *op. cit.*, I, 189.

12. The term *boier* has been the popular, if historically inaccurate, name for all large landowners. The problem of ascertaining the boyar's original role resembles in some respects the confusion in Russian history between allodial hereditary landowners and the nobility of service. The villages of free peasants (răzeşi in Moldavia and moşneni in Wallachia) pose, in respect to their nature and origins, questions similar to those relating to the Russian *mir* and the South Slav *zadruga*. Illuminating discussions of these points may be found in H. H. Stahl's article, "Organizarea socială a ţărănimii," in *Enciclopedia Romîniei* (4 vols., Bucarest, n.d.), I, 559–576, and in his recent book, *Sociologia satului devălmaş romînesc* (Bucarest, 1946), I.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

423 the majority of the peasants were bound as *rumâni* (the most com-
● 566 mon term for serfs). In its form as in its relatively late flowering the Rumanian servile system more nearly resembled that of Russia than that of western Europe.

The life of the Rumanian serfs was bitter and squalid, as is illustrated by periodic mass flights across the Danube or into Transylvania. Their burdens resulted from their being on the bottom of the social structure of a state first fighting and then subservient to the Ottoman Empire and from the task of supporting, in a relatively self-sufficient economy, the needs of the boyars and their retainers. Although the growing boyar domination was a gradual process and apparently accompanied an internal breakdown of the village community, the act of binding the peasant to the land, carried out as a general measure by Michael the Brave (*ca.* 1558–1601), had, in large part at least, a military and political purpose: to insure a settled population able to provide military supplies. However, while the tax burden and the tributes owing the Turks were transmitted from prince and boyar to the back of the peasant, servile labor obligations, the *clacă*, were relatively light. The population was sparse, and the boyars were not reluctant to grant the peasants land, of which there was an abundance, provided, of course, they paid their tithes in kind.

566 Toward the middle of the eighteenth century two new elements ap-
175 pear: increasing state legislation, superseding or codifying customary practices, and the growth of commercial activity. The twin action of these two factors becomes ever more important right through the nineteenth century, and on their interrelation hangs much of the agrarian problem. Both were destructive of the old closed society of traditional rights and a relatively static economy; both were introduced from without. Sometimes they reinforced one another in promoting change; sometimes one held the other in check.

Around 1750 the Phanariot prince, Constantin Mavrocordat, formally abolished serfdom in an act anticipating and resembling the Habsburg Emperor Joseph II's emancipation of 1781. Although this act, in principle, relieved the peasant of personal bondage and of being tied to the land, it did not rid him of labor obligations or dues to the boyar for the use of the land he cultivated. Indeed, at about the same time the boyars initiated a persistent and successful effort to increase the number of days of the clacă and to define a working day in terms which greatly exceeded what a peasant could actually accomplish in one day. Simultaneously, they began to estab-

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

lish and extend seigneurial monopolies on such activities as milling and the sale of wine.

Both actions clearly arose from the growing commercial possibilities of these years. The Turks were increasing their imports of grain from the principalities, and despite Turkish restrictions trade was developed with neighboring states. Hence it was in the interest of the boyars to increase the amount of labor available to them and to monopolize profitable commercial undertakings. One direct consequence of this new commercial pressure on the peasant was the revolt led by Tudor Vladimirescu in 1821 "against the boyars who have devoured our rights."

The next step is signalized by the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, which opened Rumanian ports to world commerce, and the Organic Statutes of 1831–32, which gave the principalities their first constitutional documents. The effect of the first was vastly to accelerate the pace of commercial expansion. At the beginning of the nineteenth century raising livestock had been the principal occupation, but it was now replaced by the cultivation of cereals, for which the acreage nearly doubled in the thirty years betwen 1829 and 1859. This expansion of commerce in cereals continued until by the outbreak of the First World War Rumania ranked fourth among the world's cereal exporters and fifth among the wheat exporters. As a result, the relative value of land steadily increased. As early as 1805 the boyars undertook to limit the peasants' right to pasture, and in 1828 Prince Sturdza announced that the peasants had no right to exploit more than two-thirds of the lord's domain.

This trend was reinforced by the Organic Statutes. Introduced during the period of Russian occupation, these acts attempted to codify, in somewhat different terms for the two principalities, the relations between boyar and peasant. In so far as they reduced arbitrary action and made precise and definite the peasant's obligations, they were to his benefit. This gain, however, was largely canceled by the fact that for the first time the lord of the land was defined as a full proprietor of his estate. The traditional concept of "master of the land" was replaced by legal ownership. In return for set labor obligations and tithes, the peasants were granted use of land not in excess of two-thirds of the estate, the remaining third being totally in the lord's hands.[13] Under this system, while the peasants had life use of

13. The extent of the lord's demesne land—the land actually cultivated under his direction—before the nineteenth century is not certain. Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 21, points out that early village maps show no separate reserve for the master of the land, but

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

423 land, it was not passed on from father to son but reverted to the landowner, who was in turn responsible for providing newly married young cultivators with a holding. In fixing the extent of land to be held by each cultivator, these acts, especially the one for Moldavia, reduced the amount customarily enjoyed for pasturage and restricted the peasants' forest rights. Although the peasant was theoretically free to move, he was in fact tied to his community by a net of regulations.

[433] With a few modifications Rumanian agrarian relations were determined by the Organic Statutes for the next third of a century. Under
● 566 them, as a contemporary observer remarked, "The principalities took
175 on a new life"; there was a marked increase in economic activity. That
421 the benefits of this activity were not generally shared by the peasants, however, is shown by their continued exodus across neighboring frontiers. They were being forced out of their old semipastoral habits, and the very increase of cereal exports could work to their disadvantage. For example, the entire 1847 wheat crop was sold in advance because of the urgent demands in other European states suffering from food shortages in the late 1840's. As a result of these premature sales, made largely through the boyars, the principalities experienced a food crisis which contributed greatly to the peasant unrest in the turbulent year 1848.

Apart from the abortive attempts at reform during the short-lived Wallachian revolution in 1848 and a moderate revision of the Organic Statutes in 1851, the next major change was the Act of 1864, which paralleled the 1848 emancipation in the Habsburg lands and the Russian emancipation of 1861. This act, promulgated for the united principalities by Prince Cuza, for political and social rather than for economic reasons, abolished the clacă and other servitudes. The peasants obtained full title to the land they had in use, based upon earlier regulations, and the landowners were given a compensation for the loss of their labor. The law followed the now recognized provision that peasant property could not exceed two-thirds of the former lord's estate. The new holdings could not be sold or alienated for a period of thirty years.

By this act, so it seemed, the remnants of the old servile system had been abolished. Possession and use of land were transformed into absolute property rights; the peasant holder was now a free proprietor, owing no servile obligations, and, indeed, the translation of the clacă and other dues into a redemption payment does seem to have dimin-

Emerit, *op. cit.*, p. 48, doubts if there is sufficient evidence to permit the positive declaration that the peasants traditionally had had the use of all the land.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

ished his burdens.[14] Yet a quarter of a century after the Act of 1864 there began those peasant disturbances which culminated in the 1907 uprising. In some way, as Dobrogeanu-Gherea said, "The year 1864 carried in its womb the terrible year 1907."

The connection, however, is not a simple one and is paradoxical in several respects. Between 1864 and 1907 Rumania continued its rapid expansion in agriculture and commerce. Exports of grain, for example, increased from about 1,400,000 tons per year in the early 1880's to nearly 2,500,000 tons in 1905. Hence it is necessary to explain how under such circumstances there should have been growing peasant discontent. Was there, to repeat that old and difficult question, increasing poverty in the midst of expanding national wealth?

In the first place, while the Act of 1864 was passed against the wishes of the boyars, by a coup d'état on the part of Prince Cuza, the administration of the country, especially local administration, was still largely under their control, and they had ample opportunity to twist the provisions of the law to their advantage. Undoubtedly many injustices were committed in its application: often the landowner was able to distribute the worst land to the peasants, holding the best in his own estate; in a number of cases false measuring standards were used, an easy trick in a country lacking basic ground surveys; sometimes the landowner so divided the holdings that the peasants were unable to reach their property without paying a toll. As a cumulative result of these malpractices it is possible that although by the law the peasants were to receive the land they had in use before the reform, they actually received less and of lower quality. Local studies of a few districts indicate that such may have been the case, but statistics are lacking to make a general conclusion.

Another criticism of the law has been that while the peasants' claims to land could not exceed two-thirds of the lord's estate, the excess demand being met by grants of state land, in those regions where the peasants' quota was less the lord was able to retain as absolute property, with no future obligation, well over the minimal one-third. Moreover, under the Organic Statutes the lord was responsible for providing newly married peasants with a holding, while the new act made no adequate provision for subsequent generations. Peasant holdings now became inheritable property to be passed on from father to children. Since the new holdings were virtually inalienable and

14. This point, as in Russia, has been much disputed, and some authors have maintained that the peasants' burdens actually increased. The comparative figures, however, which are provided by Emerit, *op. cit.*, p. 516, if they are accurate and representative, show a considerable falling off of the amount owed by the peasant.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

566
175
433

since the practice was to distribute land equally among heirs, there was an inevitable tendency, on many peasant holdings at least, toward a progressive subdivision of the property. This tendency has been regarded as one of the worst consequences of the reform: "At the end of three generations, the land distributed by Cuza to the rural workers was dispersed into an impalpable dust." [15] Unquestionably the fragmentation of holdings constituted a major obstacle to the introduction of rational agricultural techniques. Further, the reform did not grant land to a number of peasants, those who previously had not performed the clacă or who were listed as f- .e proprietors. Finally, an examination of the size of the lots granted to the peasants reveals that a large number of cultivators did not receive enough land in the first place to enable them to establish a self-supporting holding on the level of cultivation then prevailing.[16]

It is clear, then, that the peasants' gains were limited, that in most cases they were not in a position to set up an independent farm, that the lord was relieved of all future responsibility, and that a n mber of categories of peasants were not taken care of. Such certainly were the drawbacks. The basis of Rumanian agriculture was not really altered. The reform of 1864 neither set Rumanian agriculture on the path of small peasant farming on the western European model—whether that was even theoretically possible, given the general nature of the Rumanian economy, will be discussed later—nor fostered large-scale farming based upon agricultural wage labor in the English or Prussian pattern.

In addition to the limitations of the 1864 reform, two other factors have been adduced to explain growing peasant dissatisfaction: the laws on agricultural contracts of 1866 and 1872, which are said to have reintroduced serfdom, and the land hunger of an increasing population. The immediate effect of the reform was to create a crisis in production and a great decline in the area sown, largely because the peasants preferred to cultivate their new holdings and refused to work for the landowners, who were faced with a serious labor shortage. The boyars attempted to compensate for this by passing special laws governing agricultural contracts, which unquestionably put the peasant at the landowner's mercy in matters regarding the fulfill-

15. Emerit, *op. cit.*, p. 519.

16. The allotments were based on an earlier threefold division of the peasants, determined by the number of oxen they possessed. Though the figures are only approximate, peasants having four oxen received roughly 6 hectares; those with two oxen 4½ hectares; and the so-called "tail-end" peasants, 2½ hectares. At the prevailing level of cultivation it was estimated that only the first class, a rather small minority of the peasantry, could obtain an assured surplus.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

ment of labor contracts and even permitted the employment of military force to drive the peasant to work. Although the harsher aspects of these laws were later abandoned, they permanently affected landlord-peasant relations and did much to justify the term neoserfdom, "the confirmation of the old servitudes in contractual form."

Yet these laws, while harsh on the peasant once he fell into the power of the landowner, would be significant only on the assumption that the peasants were increasingly obliged to go to the landowner for assistance. That is, the laws of contracts merely accelerated the relapse into a servile system—one lacking the paternalistic protection of the old order—but were not in themselves the cause of a deteriorating situation. Moreover, the peasant uprisings did not occur when the laws were at their harshest but later when some of the worst provisions had been abrogated.

Land hunger, in general, results from an excess of population relative to the amount of land available. As has been noted, at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Rumanian principalities were not thickly settled, though even at the time of the Organic Statutes it was not possible to give adequate grants of arable land to the peasants in the old and relatively thickly settled mountainous districts. By the middle of the century the boyars were invoking population pressure to explain the high cost of land. There is no question that in the second half of the nineteenth century Rumania's population expanded at a very rapid rate.

At the same time, however, the expansion of land under cultivation appears to have been increasing even more rapidly, as the plough was put to untilled pastures, waste, and meadow.[17] The extent to which the peasants were able to benefi' from this expansion of cultivated area cannot be estimated with any precision. Undoubtedly much of it took place on large estates under the control of the landowners. To some extent, too, it resulted from the peasants converting their pasture land to arable. The act of 1864 had made no provision for communal pasturing; the small peasant holdings were inadequate for both grain and livestock, and from 1864 there is a notable decline in animal husbandry. It is estimated that whereas in 1860 meadows and pasture comprised 33 per cent of the total surface of Rumania, they were reduced to 17 per cent in the years 1901–5, thus offsetting to a considerable degree the gain in land under cultiva-

17. According to Constantin Garoflid, *Chestia agrară în Romînia* (Bucarest, 1920), p. 128, between 1859 and 1899 the population of Rumania increased by 54 per cent, whereas the area of land under cultivation increased by 85 per cent between 1862 and 1905.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

making greater demands upon both the land and the peasant. Since his profits tended to be in direct proportion to the area he was able to lease, there was a marked inclination to build up vast agricultural trusts, some of which covered more than 100,000 hectares. Although ultimately the large tenant was a consequence rather than a cause of the agrarian problem, he was the focus of hatred and abuse: hated by the peasants because he dealt directly with them, verbally abused by the landowner-politicians who made him their scapegoat. Certainly some of the more spectacular injustices and preposterous labor contracts can be found on lands operated by tenants.

This speculative interest on the part of the tenant in acquiring more land contributed to a rapid rise in rents. Between 1870 and 1906 rents mounted between 100 and 200 per cent for a third of the properties and over 200 per cent for another third. The peasants consequently were obliged to pay more dearly for the use of land. In 1870 they generally retained from two to four parts of the produce of rented land and delivered one part to the landowner or large tenant; by 1906 in over half the cases studied in an investigation, the ratio was one to one.[21]

The rise in the value of land was not accompanied by an equivalent improvement in agricultural techniques. Most of the peasants were both inexperienced in the careful cultivation of small holdings and financially unable to improve their methods, and the large landowners and tenants had little incentive. By the working of the 1864 reform the peasants remained attached to their strip of land, lacking even the free mobility of the farm laborer. They continued to own most of the means of production: over 90 per cent of the draft animals, ploughs, and harrows in Rumania belonged to the peasants.

Under these conditions the distinction between large-scale and small-scale farming was blurred, and it was characteristic of the latifundiary cultivation prevailing in Rumania that the size of an undertaking was not determined by an organized integration of the productive factors of a given area but was rather the arithmetical sum of a large number of peasant cultivations. The peasant, in return for a piece of land, contracted either to cultivate another piece of land for the proprietor or tenant or to share the produce in a form of metayage. Money payments were uncommon except in Moldavia.[22]

21. Creangă, *op. cit.*, II, 18-22.

22. It must be observed, however, that while the great estates did not, in most cases, utilise progressive farming methods, the output of the large farms was consistently higher than that of the peasant holdings. The reasons for this difference have been the occasion of much dispute. Supporters of large-scale cultivation have held that despite

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

of property relations followed a different course from that in the West, and in both countries contact with the West created a steadily increasing crisis which the legislative measures of the nineteenth century did not solve and in some respects exacerbated. In neither case did peasant emancipation lead to the healthy development of small holds but rather to the appearance of the land-hungry cultivator still in a position of dependence on the landowner.[26]

While there were these similarities in Russian and Rumanian social and economic life, and more than a casual parallel in the development of agrarian relations, the political and international positions of the two states were entirely different. This difference explains in part some of the very great divergences in the recent history of these countries.

Political Aspects of the Agrarian Question

Although Rumanian economic and social relations were such as to create a dangerous tension in the countryside, politically, in marked contrast to tsarist Russia, there was relatively little revolutionary activity. This difference has often been attributed to the lethargy and supineness of the Rumanian peasant or to his Daco-Roman stability and love of order and hard work. National qualities may have played some part, though the violence of the 1907 revolt was damaging to many such theories. A more substantial reason would appear to lie in the contrast between the political and international situations of the two states.

Russia, a great empire, was assured of its independence as a nation. Existing institutions were firmly fixed. Russian social reformers could direct their energies toward internal issues without being preoccupied with the question of national survival. For these reasons the climate was favorable to a revolutionary spirit. Quite opposite conditions obtained in Rumania, a newly created state whose position in the community, or anarchy, of nations was by no means secure. Many Rumanians were not as yet included within the country's

26. The sensitivity in Rumania to developments in Russia would suggest the presence of common characteristics. The Russian emancipation of 1861 was followed by Prince Cuza's Act of 1864. There is evidence that the Rumanian rising of 1889 was aroused by a rumor that the tsar had ordered land to be divided among the peasants. The Russian Revolution of 1905 found a reflection in the 1907 revolt in Rumania, and of course the Russian Revolution of 1917 had a direct bearing upon the Rumanian agrarian reforms of 1918–21. The correlation of these events is certainly more than a chronological coincidence. It might be added that Stolypin's program to reform Russian agriculture by creating a class of strong peasant holdings resembles some of the recommendations put forward by the Conservative agrarian expert Constantin Garofid.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

668 175

boundaries. Consequently, national aims and ambitions tended to receive first attention from all articulate Rumanians.

Whatever may be the answer to the much debated question of Rumanian origins, the two principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia, did not make their appearance until the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. After a couple of centuries of precarious independence they fell under the domination of the Ottoman Empire. For a time native princes maintained some degree of internal authority; later Phanariot Greeks became the *hospodars* of the principalities; but the two provinces were not united until 1862, and the remnants of Turkish suzerainty were not shaken off until the Russo-Turkish War of 1877. While the Rumanians did contribute to achieving their national independence, the rise of a united Rumania was largely conditioned by events beyond their control: the decline of the Ottoman Empire, the repulse of Russia in the Crimean War, and the equilibrium established by the Concert of Europe at the Congress of Berlin. Rumania's independence and existence as a national state were thus externally determined, at least in the negative sense of permitting the Rumanians to enjoy some freedom of action in the nineteenth century.

● [566] The national progress of Rumania did not correspond with the social or material progress of the peasantry. On the contrary, the high points in Rumanian history from the national point of view often marked a decline in the peasant's status. The process of social differentiation which followed the foundation of the principalities seems to have led to a further subjugation of the peasant to the boyar. Under Michael the Brave, who for a short period ruled over all Rumanian lands, the peasants were definitely bound to the land. The Organic Statutes represented an advance constitutionally but also granted full proprietorship to the boyars and rendered the peasants' tenure even more precarious. To be sure, such a process is not unusual; in a society which is becoming more articulated the emerging ruling elements, which from a national aspect represent an advance by strengthening and organizing the state, may achieve their position at the expense of the more amorphous body of that society.

Because of the weakness and precarious position of the Rumanian state, preoccupation with national prestige outweighed and often ran counter to concern for social reform. In the abortive revolution of 1848 the young revolutionaries, educated in France, were undoubtedly fired by ideals of freedom and the rights of man, but more from desire to create in Rumania a proper modern state than from direct interest in the sufferings of the peasant. The manifestoes issued by the Muntenian revolutionaries promised land but at the same time,

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

642 of these institutions naturally became mere façades to conceal a much cruder reality. Party politics, for example, bore a very superficial re-
665 semblance to those of nineteenth-century England: two principal parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives, alternated in office. But the reality behind this two-party system was altogether different. Politics were based on a very narrow franchise,[30] the parties themselves tended to be coteries surrounding a dominant personality or family, and there were constant factions and party splits. Both the Conservatives and the Liberals obtained their support from the landowners, the principal distinction between them being that the Conservatives were usually the explicit spokesmen of the large agrarian interests, whereas the Liberals were increasingly interested in making Rumania a strong modern (i.e., commercial and industrial) state and held the controlling positions in the growing financial institutions.

671 In the field of law the Rumanians demonstrated what Dobrogeanu-
177 Gherea correctly called a "mania for legislation." A flood of laws was continually being passed—elegantly rendered by men who had taken their law course at Paris—but with remarkably little effect. Some were inapplicable at the outset, few were administered properly, and most were soon forgotten by all concerned, with no effort made to examine their consequences. Other examples could be cited from the fields of public finance, civil rights, and the press to illustrate the abyss lying between political and constitutional forms and actual practice. The persistence of this dualism right up to the 1940's has undoubtedly had a corrupting effect upon Rumanian politics and society.

566 Notwithstanding these contradictions, which have struck all for-
177 eign observers in the past century, the very introduction of Western paraphernalia had certain important positive effects. A peasant who had been inducted, under universal conscription, into the army, who could read in the press (or have read to him) about agrarian disturbances in Sicily, Ireland, or Russia, or who heard the charges and countercharges of the political parties, however rhetorical these may have been—such a peasant was moving out of the closed circle of the village. This is evidenced in the active role played by ex-army ser-
185 geants, clerks, and schoolteachers in the 1907 uprising. Moreover, the mere existence of constitutional and legal devices, however in-
177 operative they may have been, provided potential channels for change and increased the flexibility of the existing order. Thus, in spite of the fact that changes were apt to prove illusory rather than real,

30. A system of electoral colleges, rather like that of Prussia before 1918, assured a preponderant strength in the assembly to the landowners and the wealthy urban groups.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

are far too complex for inclusion here. Whatever the origins of the Transylvanian population, at the outbreak of the First World War the Rumanians constituted a majority of the inhabitants of this region; with the collapse of Austria-Hungary, the Transylvanian Rumanians, along with the other ethnic groups in the empire moved to break away. On October 12, 1918, the Rumanian National party of Transylvania drafted a resolution demanding the right of self-determination. A national assembly was called at Alba Iulia on December first and passed a resolution in favor of the union of all Rumanians. The basis of this union was to be:

1) full national liberty for all races;
2) full autonomy for all regions;
3) a democratic regime with general, direct, equal, and secret elections;
4) complete liberty of press, assembly, and association;
5) radical agrarian reform;
6) equitable conditions for industrial workers.

A Governing Council (*Consiliul Dirigent*), under Iuliu Maniu, was established as the temporary administration. The Treaty of Trianon assigned Transylvania and the adjacent regions of Maramureş, Crişana, and the Banat to Rumania.

Servile tenures had been abolished somewhat earlier in Transylvania than in the Old Kingdom, and the relative importance of medium properties reflected the generally higher level of cultivation. Nevertheless, there was a great disparity between large and small properties, a disparity intensified by the national question. The Rumanians were almost entirely peasants, and most of the large estates belonged to Hungarians. Reliable information, however, is lacking regarding the distribution of land either by size of property or by nationality; according to Hungarian critics of Rumanian statistics, no exact figures have ever been available for the land distribution in 1919 in the total area annexed by Rumania.[24] The Rumanians have claimed that they held only 24 per cent of the total area and that 98 per cent of the properties over 100 cadastral yokes (the yoke, used in Transylvania, equals .58 hectares) were held by non-Rumanians. While this claim may have been extreme, Hungarian sources grant that 87 per cent of the owners of properties exceeding 100 yokes were Magyars.

The project for the land reform, prepared in thirty-two sittings of the Governing Council, became a decree-law on September 12,

24. C. A. Macartney, *Hungary and Her Successors* (Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 316, n. 2.